1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NORTHERN DIVISION, AT KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE
3	
4	United States of America, :
5	:
6	Government, : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :
7	:3:13cr78
8	Janet Welch, :
9	Defendant, :
10	Transcript of Change of Plea before the
11	Honorable Amul R. Thapar on Monday, July 29, 2013.
12	APPEARANCES:
13	AFFEARANCES.
14	ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT:
15	F.M. Hamilton, III David Lewen
16	Assistant U.S. Attorney
17	
18	ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT:
19	Robert Kurtz Attorney at Law
20	1100021107 000 2011
21	
22	Jolene Owen, R.P.R. 800 Market Street, Suite 131
23	P.O. Box 2201 Knoxville, Tennessee, 37901
24	(865) 384-6585
25	
	1

MR. HAMILTON: Yes.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay, great. Thank you.

Ms. Welch, I know you have answered a number of questions already this morning, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to go through a list of questions as well. It's important that you understand my questions, and I am going to cut you a deal. That is if you don't understand my questions, you stop me and tell me you don't understand them. I will rephrase them in a way that is more coherent. Is that, can we have that agreement? MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Can you please place the

defendant under oath.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes, Your Honor.

JANET WELCH

was first duly sworn and testified as follows:

THE COURT: Now, Ms. Welch, you went over an Information with Judge Guyton, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And you waived reading of that indictment or the Information, is that correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, I just want to ask you a few questions about that before I let you fill out that waiver.

Mr. Kurtz, I am going to ask questions. Judge Guyton asked some questions as to competence before he went through his proceeding. I am going to do

competent to proceed. It's clear to me that she understands my questions. She is looking me in the eye and is proceeding as someone should.

Mr. Hamilton, do you have any question as to this defendant's competence to plead at this time?

MR. HAMILTON: The government does not.

THE COURT: Great.

Now, you went over the Information, you reviewed it, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I just want to talk to you for a couple of minutes about your rights with regard to a grand jury charge versus an information charge. Once I understand that you understand your rights, then I will let you sign the waiver, okay?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You understand you have a constitutional right to be charged by an indictment of a grand jury, but you can waive that right and consent to being charged by information of the United States, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I am going to go over a few other things. I am going to read them to you and then I am going to ask them to you. Instead of an

indictment the felony charge in this has been brought by the United States Attorney by the filing of an Information. Unless you waive indictment, you cannot be charged with a felony, unless a grand jury finds by return of an indictment that there is probable cause to believe that a crime has been committed and that you committed it. If you do not waive indictment, the government may present the case to the grand jury and request it to indict you. The grand jury is composed of at least 16 individuals and not more than 23 people, at least 12 of whom must find that there is probable cause to believe that a crime has been committed and that you committed the crime in order to return an indictment against you.

The grand jury might or might not indict you.

If you waive indictment by the grand jury, the case will proceed against you on the information just as though you have been indicted.

Do you understand all of your rights with regard to the grand jury?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone made any threats or promises to induce you to waive your right to be charged by a grand jury?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: If you choose to be charged by 2 information, you do not give up any of your other constitutional rights and we'll go over those during the 3 4 plea proceeding. Have you gone over those with your 5 attorney? 6 MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: They are also listed in your Plea 8 Agreement, correct? 9 MS. WELCH: Yes, sir. 10 THE COURT: You understand all those 11 constitutional rights? 12 MS. WELCH: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: Great. 14 Mr. Kurtz, have you gone over her rights vis-a-vis the grand jury and the information with her? 15 16 MR. KURTZ: I have. 17 THE COURT: And based on your consultation with her do you believe she understands her rights? 18 19 MR. KURTZ: I do. 20 THE COURT: Do you believe she understands that 21 by waiving her rights she can be charged with an 22 information? 23 Yes, sir, Your Honor. MS. WELCH: 24 THE COURT: Ms. Welch, do you wish to waive

your right to indictment by a grand jury and choose to

I know Judge Guyton has already unsealed the

THE COURT: Did you talk to him about

everything you know about the case?

24

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir, Your Honor.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE COURT: Are you happy with your lawyer's 2 advice and representation in this case? 3 MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. I want to go over -- I know 4 you have discussed with him the maximum penalties. 5 know you heard them from Judge Guyton as well or 6 7 Mr. Hamilton may have stated them. I want to go over 8 them with you as well. 9 It's my understanding you are pleading guilty 10 to a 371 charge, which I call just a conspiracy to 11 commit a criminal offense, a federal criminal offense. 12 Is that correct? 13 MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Do you understand that carries with it a statutory maximum penalty of five years in prison, 15 16 correct? 17 MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: It also carries with it a fine of 18

THE COURT: It also carries with it a fine of not more than \$250,000, a mandatory special assessment of a hundred dollars, restitution and potential forfeiture. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Finally, I want to talk to you about supervised release. I left that out. It carries with it a term of three years, up to three years of

supervised release. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, supervised release is a period of supervision that follows any period of incarceration. All right?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And it puts conditions on you that

THE COURT: And it puts conditions on you that are stricter than society in general. I am going to give you an example. I could say to you as a condition of your supervision, for example, that you either -- let's say you have to finish college. Okay, now, any one else in society doesn't have to do that, right?

THE COURT: Okay, so let's say that you have two years to finish college, even though you have only got one year in, because I want you to finish in the three years of supervision. Does that make sense?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's say you don't finish in two years. What happens to you?

MS. WELCH: I could be incarcerated.

THE COURT: That's right. Then your supervision could start anew. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

MS. WELCH: Right.

THE COURT: It can be like a revolving door if

you don't comply with the conditions of supervision, do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand in order for the government to prove you guilty of a criminal violation they have to prove you guilty beyond a reason doubt?

MS. WELCH: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you understand that is a difficult standard of proof?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to tell you something about a supervised release violation. If, for example -- I am going to give you another condition. I say you can't drink alcohol. Mr. Hamilton learns you are drinking alcohol. He can bring a charge that you violated your terms of supervision to the Court's attention. He only needs to prove that by a preponderance of the evidence. What that means is he just has to show it's more likely than not and tip the balance of the scales of justice in his favor, which is much different than beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions about

that?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you any questions about any of the maximum penalties in this case?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if the Court accepts your plea of guilty it can impose the maximum penalty?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand if the plea of guilty is accepted, the Court can impose the same penalty as though you pled not guilty, stood trial and were convicted by a jury?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand the offense to which you are pleading guilty is a felony offense and that if your plea is accepted you will be adjudged guilty of that offense and such adjudication may deprive you of valuable civil rights such as the right to vote, right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury and the right to possess any kind of firearm?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Are you a citizen of the United States?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Do you understand people who are not citizens of the United States, if they plead guilty

to this offense, they will most likely be deported?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to talk to you about the collateral consequences of pleading guilty. What I mean by that is I want to talk to you about what happens when you plead guilty. I am just going to give you some examples, but I want you to understand the examples are much broader. For example, in the example it's easier to understand what I mean.

By pleading guilty you can lose any professional license. You loose the right to possess a firearm which means you lose concealed carry or other licenses you have with regards to guns. You will also find that, as a convicted felon, it is much more difficult to find a job. These are just some of the examples of what a collateral consequence is of pleading guilty. They are much broader than that. I can't even imagine some, nor can you.

Do you understand by pleading guilty there are ramifications that we can't even think about today?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you and your attorney talk about how the sentencing guidelines might apply in your case?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to talk to you about that as well. The first thing I want to tell you is that the sentencing guidelines are now merely advisory. What that means is they are a starting benchmark for the Court. The Court uses them along with the factors found in 18 United States Code § 3553(a), which are the statutory factors of sentencing. Did you go over those with your attorney?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the Court will use the guidelines and the statutory factors to determine what a sufficient sentence is in your case?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions at all about how sentencing works?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand the Court will not be able to determine a sentence for your case until after the Presentence Report has been completed and you and the government have had an opportunity to challenge the facts and conclusions reported by the probation officer?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand the Court is not bound by any stipulation of facts between you and the

government and the court will with the aid of the Presentence Report determine what facts are relevant to sentencing?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that parole has been abolished and, if you are sentenced to prison, you will not released on parole?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand even if the Court can place you on probation, it may or may not do so?

MS. WELCH: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions about anything we have gone over so far?

MS. WELCH: No, sir.

THE COURT: I want to talk to you about your constitutional rights. The Court reminds and advises you that under the Constitution and laws of the United States you have the right to plead and the persist in your plea of not guilty. You have the right to be tried by a jury and at a speedy and public trial you would have the right to the assistance of counsel, right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses who testify against you and the right to refuse to testify yourself, unless you voluntarily chose to do so in our own defense.

If you decide not to testify, that cannot be held against you and the jury will be instructed that they cannot hold it against you. At such trial you would be presumed innocent until such time, if ever, as the government established your guilt by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. At such trial you would be entitled to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses on your behalf.

The government would have to pay for the attendance of witnesses, if you could not afford to do so. Do you understand if you plead guilty you give up all the rights I have just mentioned?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand if you plead guilty there will not be a further trial of any kind in your case so that by pleading guilty you are giving up the right to a trial?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If you plead guilty, do you understand you will also have to waive your right not to incriminate yourself since I will have to ask you questions about what you did in order to satisfy myself that you are guilty as charged and you will have to acknowledge your guilt?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you willing to waive and give up your right to trial and the other rights I have just discussed?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hamilton, how many plea agreements have been tendered to the defendant?

MR. HAMILTON: One.

THE COURT: Okay is this the most favorable -obviously, if it's one, it's the most favorable one she
could receive? In other words, maybe it's a better
way -- that is a bad question.

You have had conversations with Mr. Kurtz before the Plea Agreement. When I look at the Plea Agreement, and I am doing this off memory, but it said something like you would only hold her accountable for the dollar amount to which she was personally responsible. You had specific guideline sections, the number of victims that -- you can correct me. I think you agreed that she didn't use sophisticated means so there were specific sections in there, correct?

MR. HAMILTON: There are references to the guidelines and the Plea Agreement. The United States made one plea offer to this defendant.

THE COURT: Did you negotiate the terms with Mr. Kurtz? That is what I am trying to get ahold of.

knowledge, that Mr. Kurtz shared all discussions that he

had with Mr. Hamilton about the Plea Agreement and your

case in particular with you?

23

24

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you feel like you have discussed and understand the terms of the Plea Agreement?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I want to go over that with you now.

Mr. Hamilton, can you give her the original.

I just want as we go, Ms. Welch -- I noticed I like this practice that they follow here. We don't do it in our district, which is they have you initial each page. Do you see that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: As I go through it I am going to ask you each time -- I know it is going to get a little repetitive, but if those are your initials because I want to be assured that the Plea Agreement in front of you is the same one that you reviewed with your attorney before signing it. Is that fair?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. You see the Plea

Agreement in front of you. It now has handwritten in it

3:13cr78. Do you see that in the upper right-hand

corner?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: It says United States of America

versus Janet M. Welch, correct?

MS. WELCH: Correct.

THE COURT: You will see that the first paragraph indicates you are going to plea to an information which we are doing here today. It lists the maximum penalties we went over, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: The second paragraph it says that you are pleading guilty because you are in fact guilty and then lists what the United States would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That goes on to the second page.

At the bottom of that page -- that is the original, you are looking at the original Plea Agreement, right?

That's the very page that you initialed before.

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Great. Now, if you look at the beginning of the second page -- and I am just going to summarize this for you. You understand if this case were to go to trial the United States would have to prove these three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes.

THE COURT: First, that you agreed with another

person to commit mail fraud. Do you see that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Again I am summarizing. That is that with the intent to defraud you helped -- so instead it says you knowingly. You conspired with another, so you worked with another, to devise and intended to devise and participate in a scheme and artifice to defraud and basically -- and I am again restating -- they are stating the exact terms in here. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I am going to try and state it in plain English because Congress writes things in one way. They are doing what they should do which is putting it in here. Do you understand that this is the language of what they have to prove?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What it means in plain English is that you agreed with another person to defraud people to get money.

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You understand that? The government would have to prove that beyond a reasonable doubt. They would also have to prove that you committed or you conspired with that person to commit mail fraud.

sentence in the range of 400,000 to \$1 million. It is

our understanding that that is intended to be a ceiling. In other words, there are two limitations, one is that the loss had to have been caused by Ms. Welch. And two that loss that was caused by her has a ceiling of \$1 million. It's possible that the range could be lower than that, depending on what the facts ultimately show.

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question,

Mr. Hamilton. I think that is fair point. If it is

between 200 and 400,000, as the probation officer

determines it, you are saying that the United States

waives the right to object to that and put on proof that

it is between 400 and a million or are you saying

something different?

MR. HAMILTON: No, I think that is exactly what we are saying. I wouldn't see it as a necessarily -- well, I don't think that we would say that. I think what we would say is that we aren't going to seek anything more than \$1 million. I don't think we are saying if the probation office determines that -- we are not waiving any right to object to the Presentence Report, but we are saying that we aren't going to seek anything, a loss figure that is outside the range of 400,000 to a million dollars.

THE COURT: That is how I understood it. That is why I asked the question.

Stay standing. I am going to ask you another question in a minute.

Ms. Welch, do you understand what the United States is bound by, as I understand this, and Mr. Hamilton, I will give him a chance to explain if I am wrong --

Is that they will not seek, even if the evidence shows you are responsible later for 1.8 million, the United States cannot seek to hold you responsible for more than a million and that is one of the benefits of your bargain.

If the Presentence Report determines that it is 300,000 the United States can put on evidence in front of me to, they can object and show that you are actually personally responsible for any amount up to a million. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hamilton, did I fairly and accurately summarize the way this works now?

MR. HAMILTON: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Additionally, now I am going on to paragraph (n). The investigation may reveal more than 50 victims were involved in the conspiracy. Now I am skipping -- and again is that the United States agrees that your participation in the conspiracy involved no

more than 49 victims and, therefore, the United States limits its ability, the way I understand this, to that number. In other words, the most the United States can seek to hold you accountable for is up to 50 victims.

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Between 0 and 49. What they are saying is it's between 10 and 49, but again I understand this to operate like the dollar figure did. If probation comes back and says it's 55, they are bound to seek 49. It doesn't mean it's binding on me. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that accurate, Mr. Hamilton?

Does this operate the same?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Finally, the United States agrees that your participation did not involve a sophisticated means. That is (o). Do you see that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The next paragraph, which is 4, goes over your constitutional rights which we have already covered, correct?

MS. WELCH: That is correct.

THE COURT: And that is your initials at the bottom of this page which is page 8.

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Paragraph 5 just goes over what, and I talked to you about this, what I will impose at sentencing which includes up to the maximum penalty, the mandatory special assessment, any applicable forfeiture in this case, restitution that may be applicable and supervised release, as we discussed before. I don't know if it lists supervised release. It does in paragraph (a).

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Great. Then paragraph 6 goes on to the next page. Is this your initials at the bottom of page 9?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Paragraph 6 talks about your level of cooperation. Paragraph 7 talks about the how the government can and cannot use your cooperation. Do you understand both of those?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: At the bottom that is your initials at page 10?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Paragraph 8 talks about that the government will bring or may bring your cooperation to the Court's attention, probably at sentencing, so that

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to talk to you for a second about Paragraph 3. Before I do so I guess I have a question for the attorneys. Mr. Hamilton, I will start with you. And that is that here it says the defendant retains the right to appeal a sentence imposed above the sentencing guideline range. Okay, there is no mandatory minimum applicable in this case. You agree with me, correct?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Can I ask you a question about the applicable guideline range? Let's say I determine the guideline range is 24 and she objects and says it should be 20. I am just making this up. Can she appeal my determination of the guideline range itself instead of -- in other words, it says above the applicable guideline range. Is it applicable guideline range as determined by me, the applicable guideline range as determined by the Presentence Report? Does that make sense?

MR. HAMILTON: Paragraph 13(a) says it's the applicable guideline range as determined by the District Court. That would be as determine by this Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

You see, determined by the District Court?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let's go over this entire thing.

First, the questions I was asking Mr. Hamilton. Do you understand that if I determined the guideline range is 24 and Mr. Kurtz says, he is crazy, it should be 20, you are stuck with that determination?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You can't appeal my determination of the guideline range.

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that in exchange for the concessions the government has given you agree you won't appeal your conviction in this case?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Once judgment is entered the only thing you can appeal is your sentence only under very limited circumstances, do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let's say your guideline range is 63 to 78 months. I am making it up, all right. Your attorney says it should have been 24 to 30 months. All right. I sentence you to 70 months. So it is 63 to 78 months, as determined by me. Your attorney says he is off his rocker, it should be 24 to 30 months. I sentence you to 70 months. Can you appeal?

range that was set.

24

25

1 THE COURT: Right. I set the guideline range. 2 That is exactly right. I set the guideline range. 3 I set the guideline range, I am stuck with that for 4 purposes of appeal. It doesn't mean I am not right. 5 You could appeal and lose, you understand that, right? 6 MS. WELCH: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Because I am allowed to vary 8 outside the guideline range both up and down based on those other statutory factors we discussed. Right? 9 10 MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have any questions 12 about that? 13 MS. WELCH: No, sir. 14 THE COURT: You have no questions about your appellate rights? 15 16 MS. WELCH: No, sir. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Paragraph (b) talks about 18 what are essentially collateral attacks filed pursuant 19 to 2255. Do you see you waive your right to 20 collaterally attack the conviction and sentence in this 21 case? 22 MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: There is one limited exception which is you can challenge the ineffective assistance of your counsel or prosecutorial misconduct that is not

known to you at the time of entry of judgment. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

ask you another question about this, but does the clause "not known to her at the time of judgment" limit her to prosecutorial misconduct and not limited to ineffective assistance? In other words, if she knows of ineffective assistance before judgment but doesn't find -- here is why I ask. Let's say she knows it, but she doesn't know it has prejudiced her until the time of judgment, it seems to me she could clearly appeal that. Does that make sense under *Strickland*?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Or collaterally attack that, not appeal that, I am sorry. In other words, is the clause only limited to prosecutorial misconduct?

MR. HAMILTON: I don't believe so, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If she knows of deficient performance, I guess, to know of ineffective assistance under the legal definition maybe you have to know both deficiency and prejudice. If she didn't know of the prejudice, she wouldn't know of ineffective assistance. Is that a fair statement?

MR. HAMILTON: I believe that would be fair,

July 29, 2013

25

page because you signed it.

MS. WELCH: That is correct.

2 THE COURT: Okay, great.

Aside from the Plea Agreement which we have just discussed, did anyone make any other promise of any kind in order to get you to plead guilty?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What we just discussed is your understanding of the full terms of the Plea Agreement?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Did I leave anything out that was critical to your decision to plead guilty?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Did I leave anything out that was something you had in your mind that someone promised you in order to plead guilty?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hamilton, did I leave anything out that was essential to the government's decision to enter into this agreement?

MR. HAMILTON: Your Honor, the government's position on that, as we stated in the past, is that all of the terms are in the Plea Agreement and the government believes that the Court has thoroughly and accurately summarized the Plea Agreement in this case.

THE COURT: Do you understand, as we discussed,

if you plead guilty a Presentence Report will be prepared and I will then consider the appropriate sentence?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Aside from the Plea Agreement, again, which we just discussed, has any person, including an officer or agent of the government, or any of the lawyers promised or even suggested that you will receive a lighter sentence or any other form of leniency, if you plead guilty?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is your decision to plead guilty your own free and voluntary act?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you been subjected to any threats or force of any kind which caused you to plead guilty?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want you to flip back to the Plea Agreement. I am going to go over the facts with you underlying the essential elements. I am going to go over them briefly because you said they are all accurate. I want to ask you about them, okay. I will ask you about specific facts. I want you to go back to page 3, I think it was, or actually page 2 is where it

```
July 29, 2013
1
    starts. You worked, as we talked about, since before
2
    2008 and I think you told me you started in 1998 at
3
    Pilot, correct?
 4
             MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay, Pilot, just so I understand,
5
    operated travel plazas that I see along the side of the
6
7
    highway.
8
             MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.
9
             THE COURT: One of the things they have is a
10
    direct sales department, right?
11
             MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.
12
             THE COURT: And you worked in the direct sales
13
    department?
14
             MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: How long did you work in the direct
15
16
    sales department?
17
             MS. WELCH: All my 16 years.
             THE COURT: From 1998 until now you have work
18
    in the direct sales department?
19
20
             MS. WELCH:
                         Yes. I actually worked in direct
21
    sales for 14 years.
22
             THE COURT: What else did you do?
23
             MS. WELCH: I worked in supply and distribution
24
    and in dispatch.
25
             THE COURT: Was that at the beginning?
```

July 29, 2013

25

companies or did you just support others who did so?

plazas had different deals, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Trucking companies it says in paragraph (e) it made it difficult for them to figure out whether they were getting the correct discounts. Is that a fair statement?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And now I am going to read paragraph (f). I want you to listen closely.

"Since at least 2008 defendant Welch has been encouraged by and generally instructed by and has agreed with other Pilot sales direct sales division employees to deceptively reduce some Pilot customers monthly rebates without the customer's knowledge."

Is that a true and accurate statement?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: To mail rebates checks that state

-- I am reading now -- "to mail rebate checks that state

fraudulently reduced rebate amounts to customers that

create and maintain the materially false pretext that

the effected Pilot customers are receiving the full

benefit of their agreement upon -- the full benefit of

their agreed upon diesel price discount with Pilot and

to make false representations by way of material

admissions that Pilot is accurately and honestly

determining the effective customer's rebate amount based on the customer's agreed upon diesel discount price with Pilot."

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you hear me read all that?

MS. WELCH: I did.

THE COURT: Is that a true and accurate

statement?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Now, paragraph (g) lists what you did specifically, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. It talks about how you participated in the conspiracy to commit mail fraud by preparing and emailing monthly spreadsheets for approval to other Pilot direct sales personnel. Tell me how that actually worked.

MS. WELCH: Each month once we got the gallons and the discount information, we have a spreadsheet we maintain. I would fill it in, send it on to my salesmen and they would reply back.

THE COURT: Did the spreadsheet include, it says here it included the deceptively reduced rebate amount for some of the listed customers. Is that a true and accurate statement?

25

1 MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Did it also include, would it 3 include -- and Mr. Hamilton, if you have any problem 4 with me asking this, I will stop. Would it include the actual amount they should get and the reduced amount --5 Mr. Kurtz, you can consult with her --6 7 -- or just the reduced amount? 8 MS. WELCH: Mine originally just showed the reduced amount. Starting in February and March it 9 10 showed both amounts. 11 THE COURT: February and March of this year? 12 MS. WELCH: Yes, sir. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Once it was approved -- and I am reading from kind of the middle of the paragraph. 14 Once the deceptive amount was approved by other 15 16 personnel, you would cause an amount generally by way of 17 a check -- we talked about this before, to be sent by 18 U.S. mail or commercial carrier. 19 MS. WELCH: Yes, sir. 20 THE COURT: And one of the customers that was 21 adversely affected was Dana Transport in New Jersey? 22 MS. WELCH: Yes, sir. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And you during your

participation in the conspiracy you knew that the mails

were being used with the intent to defraud, among

July 29, 2013

25

rebates that were owed to the customers and so Pilot

could create and maintain the false pretense that those customers were in fact receiving their agreed upon diesel price discount with Pilot for the purpose of inducing those customers to continue their purchasing of diesel fuel from Pilot rather than a competitor." Is that accurate?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything I said about that that is inaccurate?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And you agree that the customers, as paragraph (j) details, relied upon the representations?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Then paragraph (k) just goes through the legalese, basically. You read that and reviewed that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You agree that we went over the essential elements earlier. Now we have gone over the facts and that you have in fact committed between 2008 and 2013 a conspiracy to defraud some of Pilot's customers by using the mails in furtherance and you conspired and agreed to do this -- let me start over.

You conspired with some of the other Pilot

that is critical in your mind? Obviously all the facts

25

are critical, as listed in the Plea Agreement, I understand that, but that is critical to her pleading guilty. In other words, have I covered all the facts underlying the essential elements?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor, for understanding the government's technical response to some of these questions.

THE COURT: I appreciate the technical response. I hope you will protect whatever you need to.

MR. HAMILTON: My only suggestion would be. I think the Court very accurately identified the universe of potential overt acts which would be e-mails and spreadsheets and checks that were mailed, but the overt act that is identified in paragraph (1) is the meeting that the Court previously referenced. That would be the government's only possible --

THE COURT: Why don't you say that so she understands it. In other words, you and I may understand what you are talking about. Just explain it.

MR. HAMILTON: As the Court previously pointed out, one of the essential elements of the conspiracy charge is the government's proof of an overt act. As the Court previously identified, there would be other facts relevant to it, to this plea process and to the guilty plea process and the overall facts. The overt

act that is identified in the factual basis in paragraph (1) to satisfy that essential element is the mandatory November 19th, 2012, sales meeting at 5508 Lonas Drive where Pilot's national accounts director led a training session which encouraged top Pilot direct sales personnel how to defraud without detection some of Pilot's customers who receive their discount in the form of a monthly rebate amount. This meeting the Court previously referenced in the preceding paragraph.

THE COURT: What Mr. Hamilton and I are talking about, Ms. Welch, so you understand it, is in order to prove you guilty the government would have to show you conspired with others and then you took actions in furtherance of that conspiracy. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: It can't be under 371, it can under a different conspiracy, that you just agreed. You actually have to take actions in furtherance of that conspiracy. Do you understand?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: There is many actions listed in this Plea Agreement, including e-mails, including the mailing we talked about to New Jersey, that would be an action in furtherance. It could be a simple phone call to a customer where you agreed. The one that the

government is specifically referencing that they would show and that you agree to is this sales meeting that occurred in November of 2012. Does that make sense?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions about that?

MS. WELCH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hamilton, is there anything else that you would like me to cover or anything I left out before I proceed to my findings?

MR. HAMILTON: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: In light, Ms. Welch, in light of everything I have told you about your rights and in light of all my questions, how do you plea to the charge listed in Count 1 of the Information, which is the conspiracy charge in violation of 18 United States Code Section 371? Guilty or not guilty?

MS. WELCH: Guilty.

THE COURT: The Court has observed the appearance and responsiveness of Ms. Welch in giving her answers to the questions asked. Based on such observation and the answers given, the Court is satisfied that she is in full possession of her faculties, she is not suffering from any apparent physical or mental illness. She is not under the

influence of narcotics or alcohol. The medication which she is taking clearly does not affect her ability to think or understand what is going on.

She understands the proceeding in which she is engaged. She understands the nature and meaning of the charges and consequences of her plea of guilt. She is aware of all plea negotiations undertaken on her behalf. The Court finds the defendant is fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea and her plea of guilty is a knowing and voluntary plea supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offense. Her plea of guilty, therefore, is accepted.

Mr. Hamilton, remind me -- I know we have been setting status conferences in this case. I just moved a bunch of them. Would you prefer I set a status conference in this case, as well, rather than a sentencing date?

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. My next question is and you just remind me if you remember, did we have probation start preparing the Presentence Reports or did we wait and just set the status conference?

MR. HAMILTON: My understanding is we are waiting for the status conference.

THE COURT: Ms. Welch, what I am going to do -Judge Guyton set the bond in your case, correct?

MS. WELCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: The only thing left for me to do is set a status conference in this case. Do you know when the status conferences are?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: I can tell you in one second.

MR. HAMILTON: I believe October 1st.

THE COURT: Do you know what time the last one we set was?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: 2:30.

THE COURT: We'll set this at 2:45.

Mr. Hamilton, is there any reason I guess -here's what I will say. If later on you determine we
can do a bunch at once, just file a motion to
consolidate them and I will consolidate them into one.
If you prefer they be handled separately, I will leave
them as is.

MR. HAMILTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: The final thing, Ms. Welch. Is at some point at the status conference we'll talk about how the Presentence Report process works. I know Mr. Kurtz will go over it with you in detail. The only thing I am going to tell you just so you know, at some point

probation will meet with you and they'll want to know a whole bunch of things about you so I can get an accurate picture of you at the time of sentencing. You are welcome to have Mr. Kurtz present there, when they meet with you. Do you understand that?

MS. WELCH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Kurtz, you will go over with her the entire presentence process. I know you have already done it, but how the Presentence Report specifically process works.

MR. KURTZ: I will.

THE COURT: Mr. Kurtz, is there anything else you think we need to handle from your perspective?

MR. KURTZ: No, Your Honor. I don't believe there is.

THE COURT: Mr. Hamilton, anything you think we need to handle with regard to Ms. Welch?

MR. HAMILTON: The only thing we need to do today, Your Honor, the original Plea Agreement from which we were speaking today has been passed back to the government's table. At this time the United States would like to file that as part of the record as the next record number.

THE COURT: Great. We'll file it after the waiver of indictment in the record.

Thank you very much for doing that. 2 MR. HAMILTON: Just so the record will be clear, when the United States filed the Plea Agreement 3 4 that the Court was reviewing, the United States had a That was received. Now we are submitting the 5 original. I have my original signature on it noting 6 7 that I signed it in court today. That is a copy of the, 8 it is the original of the copy previously filed. 9 THE COURT: Thank you very much. That and the waiver of indictment will be filed in the record. Judge 10 11 Guyton already unsealed the case, correct? 12 MR. HAMILTON: That is correct, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Welch, thank you. I will see you whenever I told you I would see you, October 1st. 14 MS. WELCH: At 2:45. 15 16 THE COURT: Thank you. Have a nice day. (Court was recessed.) 18 I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS AN ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE 19 ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

22

17

JOLENE OWEN.

23

Registered Professional Reporter United States District Court Eastern District of Tennessee

24

25